

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary****Application No.**

10/593,331

**Applicant(s)**

HAYASHI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Matthew E. Hoban

**Art Unit**

1793

**All Participants:**(1) Matthew E. Hoban(2) Steve Catlin**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 14 January 2010**Time:** 11:00**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.****Rejection(s) discussed:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Claims discussed:***Claim 1, 2, 4, 9 and 22***Prior art documents discussed:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***Discussed adding limitations of Claim 22 to Claim 1 in order to distinguish the claims over the prior art. Further discussed cleaning up the claims based on this amendment. Amendment was authorized by the applicants leading directly to allowance.***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)